

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 23-md-03084-CRB

This Order Relates To:
ALL ACTIONS

ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE SEALED

Re: Dkt. No. 160

In connection with their Motion to Enforce PTO No. 2 and to Compel Defendants to Produce Litigation Hold Information, Plaintiffs filed an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should Be Filed Under Seal. Dkt. No. 160. In the motion, Plaintiffs take no position on whether the materials in question should be sealed. Defendants—the designating parties—did not file a statement or declaration in support of sealing as required by Local Rule 79-5(f)(3). The motion is therefore denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 3, 2024

CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28